

## REMARKS

The Final Office Action, mailed July 31, 2007, considered claims 1–61. Claims 1–19, 26, 28, 31, 33, 36–37, 40–42, 44, 49, 51, and 54–61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Stanford et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,240,168 B1 (filed Oct. 29, 1998) (hereinafter Stanford). Claims 20–25 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford, in view of Freadman, U.S. Patent No. 6,546,262 (filed Nov. 13, 2000) (hereinafter Freadman). Claims 27, 29–30, 32, 34–35, 38–39, 43, 45–46, 48, 50, and 52–53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford, in view of Cannon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,603, 855 (filed Oct. 21, 1999) (hereinafter Cannon), in further view of Lehtinen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,518,957 (filed Aug. 8, 2000) (hereinafter Lehtinen).<sup>1</sup>

By this response, claims 1 and 54 are amended and claims 76–80 are newly added. Claims 1–61 and 76–80 remain pending. Claims 1 and 54 are independent claims which remain at issue. Support for the amendments and newly added claims may be found within Specification pp. 2–5, 14–20, 23–26, *inter alia*.<sup>2</sup>

As reflected in the claims, the present invention is directed generally toward embodiments for using telephony controls on a personal computer. Claim 1 recites, for instance, in combination with all the elements of the claim, a computer system for executing a telephony application. The system includes an application having telephony functionality for handling telephony-related communication signals, the application being enabled to execute telephony-related communication tasks and telephony functionality in response to user input. The system includes a graphical user interface providing a telephony control for inputting a plurality of telephony commands, the graphical user interface enabled to receive user commands. The system includes an operating system comprising control handling logic and indicator/display logic, and being operably coupled to the telephony control and the application, the operating system being enabled to receive an input command from the telephony control and to send the input command to the application. And, the system includes a communications controller enabling a user to connect to each of a plurality of

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

<sup>2</sup> However, it should be noted that the present invention and claims as recited take support from the entire Specification. As such, no particular part of the Specification should be considered separately from the entirety of the Specification.

communications channels, and the controller enabled to receive data and output data on each of a plurality of devices.

Claim 54 recites, in combination with all the elements of the claim, a method related to the system of claim 1. The method includes providing a telephony control in a graphical user interface enabled to receive user input for a plurality of telephony tasks. The method includes receiving a control input for a telephony task through the telephony control. The method includes the telephony control forwarding the control input to an operating system, the operating system comprising control handling logic and indicator display logic and being coupled to the telephony control and to a telephony application. The method includes the operating system forwarding the control input to the telephony application. The method includes the telephony application performing a telephony task in response to the control input. The method includes providing a communications controller enabling a user to connect to each of a plurality of communications channels, and the controller enabled to receive data and output data on each of a plurality of device.

Stanford, on the other hand, cited in the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections of independent claims 1 and 54, discloses a method and apparatus for controlling a computer to implement telephone functions with a displayed telephone of variable size. However, Stanford fails to disclose the ability to connect to a plurality of communications channels and fails to disclose the ability of connect to a plurality of devices. Further, Stanford fails to disclose the ability to switch, during a call, from one communications channel to another and fails to disclose the ability to switch from one device to another device.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Stanford. The Applicants submit that, as now amended, Stanford fails to teach each and every element of claim 1. Further, the Applicants submit that Stanford fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 being arranged as required by the claim.

In particular, Stanford fails to teach, *inter alia*, a communications controller enabling a user to connect to each of a plurality of communications channels, and the controller enabled to receive data and output data on each of a plurality of devices. Although Stanford teaches some telephony controls which may be connected to a telephone device, Stanford fails to teach that a controller may connect to each of a plurality of channels. Further, Stanford fails to teach that data may be received and data may be output on each of a plurality of devices.

Because Stanford fails to teach each and every element of the claim as now recited and because Stanford fails to teach each element arranged as required by the claim, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 would be improper and should be withdrawn. In view of the amendments and the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the claim as now amended.

Claim 54 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Stanford. The Applicants submit that, as now amended, Stanford fails to teach each and every element of claim 54. Further, the Applicants submit that Stanford fails to teach each and every element of claim 54 being arranged as required by the claim.

In particular, Stanford fails to teach, *inter alia*, providing a communications controller enabling a user to connect to each of a plurality of communications channels, and the controller enabled to receive data and output data on each of a plurality of devices. As in the above discussion, Stanford fails to teach that a controller may connect to each of a plurality of channels and Stanford fails to teach that data may be received and data may be output on each of a plurality of devices.

Because Stanford fails to teach each and every element of the claim as now recited and because Stanford fails to teach each element arranged as required by the claim, a rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 would be improper and should be withdrawn. In view of the amendments and the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the claim as now amended.

Claims 76–80 have been newly added. These claims recite material clearly not taught by Stanford (as well as other references). The Applicants respectfully request full consideration of these newly presented claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time.<sup>3</sup> It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future,

---

<sup>3</sup> The remaining claims are dependent claims which are dependent upon independent claims 1 or 54 which, as amended, should be in condition for allowance.

should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 31 day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973